# CAPjournal: Guide for Peer Reviewers

## Scope of the Journal CAPjournal shall publish papers with aims to share best practice in astronomy engagement and the science of communicating astronomy. The following table summarize the general principle of the papers that we accept and reject.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Accept | Reject |
| Evaluating how to communicate the science of sunspots. | Explaining the science of sunspots. |
| Reviews the good and bad in organizing an activity related to solar observation. | Reports an activity on solar observations. |
| Informal education or outreach activities. | Formal education inside a classroom. |
| Evaluation of an activity. | Description of an activity. |
| Evaluation of the communication strategies of an organization. | Report of the activities of an organization. |

## For non-evidence based papers, we also accept (1) short opinion pieces on tropical issues, (2) correspondences responding to previous publications (3) review of resources, and (4) guides on new technologies or innovations.

**Suggested length**The suggested length of the papers (references included) are

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Announcement | 100 words summary, max 1150 words, 2 figures |
| Interview | 100 words summary, max 1150 words, 2 figures |
| Opinion | 100 words summary, max 1150 words, 2 figures |
| Best Practice | 100 words summary, max 5000 words, 6 figures |
| Resources | 100 words summary, max 1700 words, 3 figures |
| Review | 100 words summary, max 1700 words, 3 figures |
| Research & Applications | 100 words summary, max 8000 words, 10 figures |
| Correspondence | Max 550 words, 1 figure |

## Reviewers

Reviewers are one the most important assets of a journal and we are very grateful to our talented pool of reviewers for their qualified and irreplaceable work.

Reviewers are selected from experts in the field who are either sought out or approach us with an interest in being involved in the reviewing process. Papers may be submitted for evaluation to at least one reviewer.

## Final decision

The Editor and Editorial Board decide upon the acceptance of each paper on the basis of the general CAPjournal editorial policy and of the peer review reports, in accordance with the following criteria:

* comparison of the different reports on the paper (in case of drastically different evaluations one or more adjudicators are consulted);
* balance of the evaluations of the different papers;
* consideration of the backlog of papers;
* consideration of the numbers of papers published in different fields.

## Peer Review Reports

The Editor keeps in contact with the reviewers via email. When a reviewer is asked to produce a report, she/he should reply to the Editor as soon as possible, stating whether she/he accepts to act as a review and stating any possible conflicts of interest. In the case of a negative answer, the suggestion of (an)other reviewer(s) is warmly appreciated.

Reviewers are asked to produce a report by filling in the peer review template (see below) and, if necessary, commenting on the article text using track changes (in Word) or edits (in PDF).

Reports should be written in such a way as to help the final decision and the communication with the authors. Suggested changes to a paper should be clearly stated. Note that in most cases the editor will judge whether the reviewer’s comments have been adequately met and the reviewer will not see the amended paper unless the second review process was requested.

When reviewer produce a report, please offer specific and constructive feedback to address problems, have a collegial tone.

The Reviewer is invited to conclude her/his assessment with one of the following recommendations:

* Accept the paper as it is
* Ask the authors for minor revision for likely acceptance
* Request major revision for another review process
* Reject

Reviewers will be given a deadline to produce their report when a paper is sent to them, which will usually be in the region of one week and this is usually negotiable. In case they need more time, cannot produce their report in a reasonable time, or are at all unable to produce a report, they are asked to contact the Editor as soon as is possible. Reports should be transmitted to the Editor by Email to the address: [editor@capjournal.org](mailto:editor@capjournal.org)
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# CAPjournal: Peer Review Report Template

Paper:   
Author:  
Reviewer: Date:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scientific Quality** | Originality of the paper, on a scale form 1-5 (5 very high, 1 very low): |
| Potential interest/relevance for the science communication community, on a scale form 1-5 (5 very high, 1 very low): |
| Conformity with the scope of the Journal which aims to share best practice in astronomy engagement and communication, in other words not purely an activity report nor explaining an astronomy concept, on a scale form 1-5 (5 very high, 1 very low): |
| Is the purpose/methodology novel? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Completeness of discussion? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Enough detail for others to reproduce the work? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| **Presentation** | Are arguments appropriate and supported by evidence? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Are conclusions justified and derived from the discussions? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Is the paper logically presented and the jargon explained? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Acceptable language and grammar? Yes/No Comments (if any): |
| Are important references included and list not too lengthy? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Are the length of the paper and its sections well balanced? Yes/No Comments (if any): |
| All figures necessary and none missing? Yes/No/NA Comments (if any): |
| Suggested section of the journal (delete as appropriate)  * Opinion (short paper on a tropical issue) * Best Practice (e.g. Lessons learnt) * Resources (resources listing) * Review (Review of books/movies/resources, review of activities should be best practice) * Research and application (evidence based research or application of research result) | |
| **Does the paper exceed the suggested length? If yes, do you think the additional length is essential? If you are asked to shorten the paper, which sessions or figures would you suggest to remove?** | |
| **Recommendation** (delete as appropriate)   * Accept the paper as it is * Ask the authors for minor revision for likely acceptance * Request major revision for another review process * Reject | |
| **Feedback to author(s)** (Please list what you like the paper first, then suggest improvements in a collegial tone) | |
| Private notes to Editor | |